## SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC., a Virginia Corporation; GREENBRIER INTERNATIONAL, INC., and DOES I through 50, inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

CENTER FOR ADVANCED PUBLIC AWARENESS, INC., in the public interest.

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfnetp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Setf-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formulanos de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuola de presentación, pida al secretano de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que

pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.	CCC - 47 - E/040
The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): San Francisco Superior Court	CASE NUMBÉR: 1 70 4 18 (Número del Caso):
400 McAllister St.	

San Francisco, CA 94102-4514

OCT 27 2017

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Kawahito Law Group APC, 222 N. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 2222, El Segundo, CA 90245, 310-746-5300

DATE: (Fecha)	ULI ZI ZUI	CLERK OF THE COURT, by (Secretario)	KALEN		Deputy <i>Adjunto)</i>
		nmons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010) ta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons		O)).	<del></del>
[SEAL]		NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served  1 as an individual defendant.  2 as the person sued under the fictitious name of			©MAMBER'S COI DO NOT FILE
,		3. on behalf of (specify):			
		under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.40 (association or partnersh other (specify):	nip)	CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.90 (authorized per	son)
		4 by personal delivery on (date):			Page 1 of 1

DATE.

KALENE APOLONIC

		CM-010				
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Ba James Kawahito 234851	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY				
Kawahito Law Group APC						
222 North Sepulveda Bivd., Suite 2222 El Segundo, CA 90245		ENDORSED FILED				
TELEPHONE NO.: 310-746-5300	TELEPHONE NO.: 310-746-5300 FAX NO.: 310-593-2520					
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Center for Advanced		San Francisco County Superior Count				
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 400 McAllister St.	an Francisco	OCT 27 2017				
MAILING ADDRESS: 400 McAllister St.						
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Francisco, CA	CLERK OF THE COURT					
BRANCH NAME: Civic Center Courtho	ouse	KALENE APOLOW				
CASE NAME:	* 5 T T O	Laputy Olo.				
Center for Advanced Public Awarer	less, Inc., v. Dollar Tree Stores, In	CASE NUMBER: # # 1 0 1				
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: 17-562186				
✓ Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	000 20				
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defend	dant JUDGE:				
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	OEPT:				
	low must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).				
1. Check one box below for the case type the		Bassalada a atha Garasalan Oladh I Mandlan				
Auto Tort		Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)				
Auto (22)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)				
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)				
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)				
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)				
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)				
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the				
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Wrongful eviction (33)	above listed provisionally complex case types (41)				
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort  Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other seed property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment				
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)				
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint				
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)				
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)				
Professional negligence (25)		Miscellaneous Civil Petition				
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05) Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)				
Employment Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)				
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)					
1 1 1		iles of Court. If the case is complex, mark the				
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana	gement:	,				
a. Large number of separately repre	sented parties d. Large number	r of witnesses				
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts				
issues that will be time-consuming		ies, states, or countries, or in a federal court				
c Substantial amount of documenta	ry evidence f. L Substantial po	ostjudgment judicial supervision				
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a	monetary b. nonmonetary; d	leclaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive				
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 2						
	ss action suit.	HAMBER'S COP				
6. If there are any known related cases, file a	and serve a notice of related case. (You n	nay use form CM-015.)  DO NOT FILE				
Date: October 27, 2017		11/				
James Kawahito						
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	NOTICE (S	BUATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)				
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the	first paper filed in the action or proceeding	g (except small claims cases or cases filed				
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result						
in sanctions.  • File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.						
If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all						
other parties to the action or proceeding.	2 740 or a complete page this server the	at will be used for statistical surposes and				
<ul> <li>Unless this is a collections case under rule</li> </ul>	3.740 or a complex case, this cover she	et will be used for statistical purposes only. Pege 1 of 2				
Form Adopted for Mendatory Use Judicial Council of California	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2:30, 3:220, 3:400-3:403, 3:740; Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3:10				
CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]		www.courlinfo.ca.gov				

San Francisco County Superior Court OCT 27 2017 JAMES KAWAHITO (SBN 234851) KAWAHITO LAW GROUP APC ERK OF THE COURT 222 N. Sepulveda Blvd. Suite 2222 KALENE APOLONIO El Segundo, CA 90245 Deputy Clerk Telephone: (310) 746-5300 Facsimile: (310) 593-2520 Email: ikawahito@kawahitolaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff the Center for Advanced Public Awareness, Inc. 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - 17-562186 8 CENTER FOR ADVANCED PUBLIC Case Number: AWARENESS, INC., in the public interest, 10 COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES Plaintiff, 11 Violation of Proposition 65, the Safe 12 VS. Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act 13 DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC., a Virginia of 1986 (Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et Corporation; GREENBRIER seq.) 14 INTERNATIONAL, INC., and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 Plaintiff the Center for Advanced Public Awareness, Inc., ("CAPA"), in the public interest, 19 alleges as follows as to matters within its own knowledge, and on information and belief as to all 21 other matters: CHAMBER'S COPY INTRODUCTION 22 DO NOT FILE 1. This action seeks to remedy the alleged failure of Defendants Dollar Tree Stores, Inc. 23 ("Dollar Tree") and Greenbrier International, Inc. ("Greenbrier") and DOES 1-50 (hereinafter 25 | individually referred to as "Defendant" and collectively as "Defendants") to warn consumers in California that they are being exposed to Di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate ("DEHP"), a substance

known to the State of California to cause cancer and developmental/reproductive toxicity.

COMPLAINT

27

28

ENDORGED

Plaintiff alleges such exposures have occurred through the manufacture, distribution, sale and consumer use of Defendants' party string cup lights (Party Lights/Lanternes de Fetes), which are imported, sold and/or distributed for sale in California by Dollar Tree and/or Greenbrier (the "Products"). California consumers are directly exposed to DEHP through the touching of the components of the Products. In addition, DEHP transferred to the hand is then ingested through hand to mouth contact.

- 2. Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. (hereinafter "Proposition 65"), it is unlawful for businesses to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals in California to chemicals known to the State to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm above the safe harbor levels, which include the No Significant Risk Levels ("NSRLs") and/or Maximum Allowable Dose Levels ("MADLs") without providing "clear and reasonable" warnings to individuals prior to their exposure.
- 3. Despite the fact that Defendants' Products allegedly expose consumers to levels of DEHP above the listed NSRLs and MADLs, Plaintiff contends that Defendants failed to provide any warnings whatsoever about the carcinogenic hazards associated with DEHP exposure.

  Moreover, Defendants' manufacture, packaging, distribution, marketing, and/or sales of the Products without the required health hazard warnings, causes consumers to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to levels of DEHP that violate Proposition 65. Thus, Defendants' conduct subjects them to civil penalties and injunctive relief.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this is brought does not specify any other court with jurisdiction.

- 5. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because they are business entities that do sufficient business, have sufficient minimum contacts or otherwise intentionally avails themselves of the California market through the sale, marketing, or use of the Products in the California market and/or by having such other contact with California so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, one or more of the violations arise in San Francisco County.

#### THE PARTIES

- 7. CAPA is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of California acting in the interest of the general public seeking to further, among other causes, the protection of the environment, awareness of dangerous chemicals in consumer products, and corporate accountability. CAPA is a "person" within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(a) and brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 8. CAPA is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant Dollar Tree Stores, Inc. is a Virginia Corporation with numerous retail stores in the state of California. Defendant is a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(b).
- 9. CAPA is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant Greenbrier,
  International, Inc. is a Virginia corporation numerous retail stores in the state of California.

  Defendant is a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Cal. Health &
  Safety Code § 25249.11(b)
- 10. CAPA is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1-50, but prays for leave to amend and serve such fictitiously named Defendants pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 474, once their names and capacities become known.

11. CAPA is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and
omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and DOES 1-50,
each acting as the agent for the other, with legal authority to act on the other's behalf. Upon
information and belief, the acts of Defendants were in accordance with, and represent the official
policies of Defendants.

- 12. At all times herein mentioned, upon information and belief, the Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, upon information and belief, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants proximately causing the damages herein alleged.
- 13. CAPA is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of Defendants are in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

## STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND

- 14. The People of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).
- 15. To effectuate this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. Cal. Health and Safety Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....

16. A product exposure to a chemical is one that "results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a product . . . .:" 27 C.C.R. §25600(h).

17. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.7. The phrase "threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur" Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.11(e). Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.7.

18. On October 24, 2003, the State of California officially listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause cancer. On October 24, 2004, one year after it was listed as a chemical known to cause cancer and reproductive/developmental toxicity, DINP became subject to the clear and reasonable warning requirement regarding under Proposition 65. 27 C.C.R. §27001(c); Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.10(b). Due to the toxicity of DEHP, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") set the NSRL for exposure to DEHP at 310 micrograms per day and a MADL of 410 micrograms per day for oral ingestion.

### STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS

- 19. CAPA purchased the Product in April 2017.
- 20. To test Defendants' Products for phthalates, CAPA engaged a well-respected and accredited testing laboratory to determine the amount of DEHP contained in the Products pursuant to testing methods adopted by the Federal Consumer Products Safety Commission. The testing revealed that the Product had levels of DEHP that Plaintiff believes would result in exposure of DEHP to consumers far higher than the limit proscribed by the NSRL and MADL.
- 21. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' Products contain sufficient quantities of DEHP such that individuals who handle the Products are exposed to significant amounts of DEHP through the average and intended use of the Products. For example, ordinary consumers absorb DEHP through the skin when they touch, use, and/or handle the Products. Ordinary consumers also ingest DEHP via hand to mouth contact after they touch, use, or handle the Products and then touch their mouths or other objects that are then placed in their mouths.

- 22. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants know and intend that consumers will use the products in manner stated above, and that they will be exposed to any chemicals such as DEHP that exist in the Products.
- 23. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants, therefore, have knowingly and intentionally exposed the users, consumers and/or handlers of the Products to DEHP without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 24. CAPA is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have, since April 2017, and continuing through the present, exposed consumers to DEHP without providing clear and reasonable warnings regarding the cancer hazards of DEHP.
- 25. As a proximate result of acts by Defendants, as persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, Plaintiff alleges they have subjected consumers to violative exposures through the normal and foreseeable use of the Products.
- 26. Any person acting in the public interest has standing to enforce violations of Proposition 65 provided that such person has supplied the requisite public enforcers with a valid 60-Day Notice of Violation and such public enforcers are not diligently prosecuting the action with such time. Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d).
- 27. On July 31, 2017, CAPA provided a "60-Day Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq." ("Notice") to the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, and the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000. Defendants were also provided a copy of the Notice. The Notice included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations including the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the violations. In compliance with California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. §3102, CAPA provided factual information on a confidential basis to the Attorney General sufficient to satisfy basis for the Certificate of Merit, including the testing performed by

CAPA, and/or its litigation consultants, and the facts, studies, or other data supporting the Certificate.

- 28. After expiration of the sixty (60) day notice period, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq. against Defendants based on the allegations herein.
- 29. CAPA has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the claims alleged herein prior to filing this complaint, and as a result, the parties have reached a consent judgment that they intend to file with the Court to resolve the claims in this lawsuit.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (Injunctive Relief Pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq.)

- 30. CAPA incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 29, inclusive.
- 31. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated California Health & Safety Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals in California to chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such persons who use, consume or handle the Products containing DEHP, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §§25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 32. By the above-described acts, Plaintiff alleges Defendants have violated California Health & Safety Code §25249.6 and are therefore subject to preliminary and permanent injunctions ordering Defendants to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers, and to provide warnings to Defendants' past customers who purchased or used the Products without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.
- 33. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).

- 34. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants actions in selling the Products without clear and reasonable warnings will irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 35. In the absence of preliminary and then permanent injunctive relief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to DEHP through the use, consumption and/or handling of the Products.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties Pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq)

- 36. CAPA incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 35, inclusive.
- 37. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Plaintiff alleges Defendants at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated California Health & Safety Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals in California to chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such persons who use, consume or handle the Products containing DEHP, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §§25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 38. By engaging in the above-described acts, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are liable, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure to DEHP from the Products in an amount in excess of \$1 million.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, CAPA prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

# As to the Causes of Action A preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to California Health & 1. Safety Code Code §25249.7(a), enjoining Defendants, their agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or participating with Defendants, from manufacturing, distributing, marketing or selling the Products in California without either reformulating the Products or providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the users and/or handlers of the Products are exposed to DEHP; 2. An Order pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a) compelling Defendants to use best methods to identify and locate each individual who purchased the Products during the statutory period, and to provide a warning to such person that the use of the Products will expose them to chemicals known to cause cancer; An assessment of civil penalties pursuant to California Health & Safety 3. Code §25249.7(b) against Defendants in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, in an amount to be determined at trial; 4. For an award to CAPA of its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and 5. For such equitable or other relief as the Court may deem just and proper. KAWAHITO LAW GROUP APC Dated: October 27, 2017 James Kawahito ttomeys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ADVANCED PUBLIC AWARENESS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27